

We don't need American leadership
toward abolition, non-prolif, non-nuclear

We need an end to American leadership
toward proliferation, threats, nuclear or arms,

US should follow / accept the initiatives
of Middle Powers, etc; China & wagant as
NFO (Hermans!), etc

• Stop opposing proposals

Threats
from

oppress / companion
identifies with
fear
desiring

CULTURAL LAG : lack of "new modes of thinking

(caring)

Control (social
relational
interaction)

POWER
As (destructive - (exploring)
coercive heat - processing
(creative?!) light -
("motion" motion - "
~~processive~~
persuasive
motivational/
manipulative
organization

increases, so does the need to ^{be able to} control
it, restrain it (manage; "ban"? restrict;
to prevent "abuse" ^{culture war}
harm to humanity ^{punish?}
life

Need to prevent (manage?!) THREAT of it.

Verbal problem (linguistic, cognitive, conceptual)

"Use," "non-use"

as copying - or not - threat

"Control" use?

- endogenous individuals (consciously, "homon")
(almost)
rel assess state of some

AS DOES THREAT, violence, prop (development?)

Ernst (or Erich) Rühl ("Rothblat")
calls for change in old modes.

[Should one - must one - "hope" that
old / current modes + policies will
not result in catastrophic?
events,

that COX will work in Afghanistan?

or, that "we can" make them work?

(without question or any
change?)

That torture will be ended - without
after decriminalizing it?

that he will restore Constitution

quickly restore employment?
promote adequate chrty/
living means?

A Ag's time to restore or absorb
before that EHO will lead like my
toward effective means without

effective org / obligation / resp. of
persons (or leadership) outside the
Enter board!

(AS 1X New Deal!) (Civil Rights!)

yes, we can

begin on possibility
or "are"

possible
responsibility
(not, prob.,)
limits

who, "we"? (white man)

agency
power

King p. 11 NUCS are now in dangerous hands!
(as. King of Rome)

(yes, some could be even more dangerous

(with weapons plan!)

(yes, Pak, NK; Iraq?)

p. 12 My thesis: we/would cont. elim./part prohib

2) reduce weapons drastically, abrogately

3) greatly reduce degree of arms attacks (-us)

4) "half more toward elim. of arms"

5) Express US leadership ("warning") to themselves

without eliminating (US) use of arms,

threat of EV

(and threat/readiness for large-scale

operation D-6/CF/implosion)

(MAD acceptable to NATO
personally [like coercion])

(our rejection of MAD but not as SecDef:

thesis: US resistance to / rejection of (6) is
a major (& sufficient) factor in (perhaps
over-determined) failure to implement Art. VI
of NPT

OWOT (old "modes of thinking"):

WAR (terrorism, slavery, genocide...)
+ think of it

as "thinkable"

legitimate (vs. invitation)
arguing proportionality

modern

(plans)

(arg.) for " (invitation)

acceptable means

a "option"

(Imagine a form of pacifism, foregoing
invitation (proportion, prevention)

B. "yes, we can" destroy env

human species

would all

(or, warm planet $> 3^{\circ}C$)

10/13/13

Madman theory:

Posing possibility
that
that

of a non-determinable FU vs. a nuclear-
armed state or an ally of one
(as we see terrorists now;

but even one that can be identified,
and has a base (& capital
cities
targets
assets

level of a nation-state

|| (Can't "terrorists" do not need to be
"mad" to threaten or launch one attacks;
not suicidal, or even reckless

(of themselves, or core
followers)

(If our aim as "mad" is the goals
(larger than our mis-represented; they
may indeed be inferior (US out of
ME, Pol. story) but for reasons USG can't
admit) + the methods (= OURS)

(see Hassan, & the way)

Nixon's problem: to be seen as non-determiner
with China or SU new world

[the goal of NATO, all ^{all free} ~~worlds~~ of
EU threats vs allies / allies (protectors)
of SU or China
(denial of SU "umbrella")

defensive (constraint of SU/China
sphere of influence / intent /
"protection" (tribute)
^{SU}
informal empire
agency

and expansion of US sphere

(zero-sum?
or a "mutual gain"?)

to be achieved with "machers"

3) rejection of determinability
of credible threats of are
retaliation, 2nd-use

or (b) by concerns for massive down uniting,
limits on retaliation

(A conjecture this, is that, deterred

LBI + MCD from full-scale firebombing, as well as are
and 1st from 3rd bomb, or is 1st; 1st/Dallas = '58?

as by (b) confidence in deterability / rationality /
control of SU (China) response
by coercion (or "art") ^{we} under attack of US on the allies & forces
US "superiority" (or "art")
(see K wnt too over in C-II;
prior to Saturday!)

contingents to
(b) - sum by
SU as possible
confidence
as expected of
HK)

a (c) Confidence in ability to limit damage
from SU attack: by (b) and by
promptness, well-timed CF, (not ABM
CD)

NO A. 13 Advocacy / retention / prevention of war (& losses,
after promptness CF power)
has not really relied on Type I but
(OR MAD) (its rejects MAD - as USAF/SAC
and VCS (as a body - defining to USAF)
and VECP / SIOA has always done)

13. On Theoria (beliefs) about God (and God's relation
to "his" creation, beasts)
are (false, mistaken, inadequate, misleading)
Theoria about (self-images of)
beasts, animals (as "souls," or different
from (other) ANIMALS (not all "good"!))

Yes, a NEU declaration could be followed
by more EU threats, of us and others,

like our "NSAs," Vance Casanova
(allied of Gulf War, Iraq War, Iran!)

and/or of a lack of actions indicates a
real change in our policy, thinking,
preps, moderns, plans, training...
(see all brain-busters, "more
usable ones, N-bomb...")
deployment (Europe! NATO!)

Declaration alone is not enough

desisting from / rejecting future
and current threats (Iran!)
must be a necessary next step;

along with...

(i.e. really changing policy — to what
most Americans now strongly believe is
now our existing policy, or at least,
under most of our past presidents
(or current!) ("not SWB" — exception!)

AND CIRCS
ARE FREQUENTLY
Really: changing EU policy is not a
matter of changing presidents

No 8 years have gone by

(only 4 years? not way! CHECK)

and no precedent has seemed

without the experience of circumstances

arising in which there is ^{4.11.11} official consideration
(of advisory) of possible (contingent) imminent "use"
of nucs.

To say "all precedents" is to say absurd;

to deny this (wrongly) is to cling to belief
that risk is entirely or mainly a matter of
probability or fact

and to underestimate the frequency of
such "crises," misestimate how "expedient"
by

My point is not that all or any US
precedents have passed over such attacks, or
been positively unhelpful (or, unwelcome) to

(not about use) "use" then, have failed to absorb (not "welcome,"
but be extremely reluctant

[have of actually acted out FU?

Did JFK or LBJ fully agree with McK?

(and McK to say he advised ^{WFO} acting at!)
or official other than McK?

Wounded?

||| Threat-use¹⁾ encourages prolif. how effective (not
likelihood toward non-prolif PRISKS (IMPL prolif)

Hyp: family possession has not turned
out to be destabilizing regionally
as feared + feared

(though an obstacle to global NP:

exposes US double-standard,
hypoing

(which is though on EU/ES posture
does more of this, ~~pointing~~ ^{pointing} towards
is right direction;

larger, pro-family America, but has
a favor against NEU, even after CW!)

BUT a family attack on family union
be very destabilizing
(as Muller just said)

Hyp: Role of US financial groups ^{on US policy} (over direction
of family? not just threat? (see Pines)
has been harmful — more so than family
possession!

(as NEU

pro- and more, ...

~~But~~

since Feb '45

"All is changed" ~~same~~ on (mostly) AF
POLICIES (US - as of bst) my - June

good state; 1945: CW (Empire, Reagan...

but Oren was no

us. collab. with SU)

(Gristin)

More monopoly / superiority

(an office "guest"
of S-S)

(Exclusion)

not conventional defence
as "Kislov")

and on modes of forming policy (US)

o basic (human / tribal / national)
premises, "instincts" prohibit for conflict / war
us. collab. across tribal / national boundaries

(see Affairs as arch-typical
of this: note the resistance to imperial
central (or imperial - building!)
but not exemplary for war)

("Right side" and not be
admirable)

"Wrong side" and not be
"all bad, or even,
to human standards, bad at all in
other respects, or abnormal, or other
than "normal, ordering" (for humanity)

aggression is not
behaviorally aberrant!

We are the wrong side, again, in Affairs.

US is ~~not~~ with a good leader, it has one
pretty, not a fellow; we are bad leaders, ("bad guys")!
we are not China (a leader in NFO
and style of posture!)

Could it be the
leader in world?
(Wf not?)

(Change FU posture w/out
Taiwan.)

(and Japan!)

(SEA?) (VN) i.e. Indonesia
Australia

Planning effort begins in 1960

!

Reducing (unsuccessfully) the danger of
nuclear weapons to possibly attacking plans
(interference?)

this goal of extermination
("boomer")

(maximizing civilian deaths while
limiting strategies SU are capable (most urgent goal,
+ SU air defense) (supposed: mostly illusions)
like fringe WMDs

in 2003

(NOT in 1991!)

It's a ^{power} they that we "can" use / ^{power} powers / control
these powers adequately, reliably, permanently,

for "greater good" (at least); not good

It is denial of the complexity of human
"nature" and "capabilities," productivity

(^{at least})
(^{valuing}) "use guidance of
Bible, "an" "God,"
priests, kings

Recognize nature of our actual, existent,
US Leadership

(the actually-existing US

West

"democracy"

first-Christian societies
"values"

Capitalism (see Moore)

(yes, we are leaders

see GWB (and BHO, now!)

is wrong direction ("counter-productive")

or confusing & promoting being
misdirected "problem-solving," "change,"

in imperialist wars (vs. VOC's),
wars of conquest, aggression
(not least, at first: initiation phase...)

there is a first cause (defence)

and "a right side" and a wrong side
"bad guys"

Initiating a war can put us in the role
of "bad guys"

not as deprived of our "allies"

perhaps a local group,
class...

Take the right side

(anti-imperial)

anti-aggression

may have many flaws, limits, & we

have committed greatly evil acts otherwise

(and may be using illegitimate means, evil (not necessary))

SU (vs. Nazis) were the right side

"Good War"

despite Stalin!

Chinese vs. Japan

" " " "

X

But in ^{VN} ~~France~~

now, Afghanistan (our enemy)

vs. Taliban

real civil war
+ Karzai/Kabul
old warlords
(Tajiks...)

vs. SU?

X

(Would there be a war without our involvement?)

for politics + morality +

- even if not in law (the Weinglass
counts at Bryan Weinglass)

a "necessity defense" can be and commonly
is used (tooth, if only - not in
due process!)

to justify law-breaking even for acts
of violence, lethality

in torture

permitted even

(perhaps one usually officials - not
really subject to prosecution, arguing

How will doing it under orders generally
be prosecuted (on BHO)

as if it were a "blatantly illegal
order," to be subject at risk
or ordered at risk

(what is, then?

shooting prisoners?

killing babies? (not)

" civilians (not)

Do we want torture to be ordered or
performed at risk (in principle - the principle
of equality under law, which is not the reality)
or NOT AT RISK (for officials: OPENLY DECLARING/ADMITTING
IMMUNITY, INEQUALITY?)